## **PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

| From the<br>INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORIT  |   | PCT   |                           |                   |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|-------------------|
| To: AALBERS, Arnt, Reinier DE VRIES & METMAN Overschiestraat 180 1062 XK AMSTERDAM  |   | WRITTEN OPINION  (PCT Rule 66)  |                           |                   |
|   |   | Date of mailing (day/month/year)  | 02/08/2004                |                   |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference WO 6050-Lg/jdh  |   | REPLY DUE  within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing       |                           |                   |
| International application No.   | International filing date   | (day month year)  | Priority date (day/mo     | nth year)         |
| PCT/EP03/50993  | 12/12/2003  |   | 20/12/2002                |                   |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC   |   |   |                           |                   |
|   | H01R13/502  |   |                           |                   |
| Applicant<br>FCI  |   |   |                           |                   |
| II Priority III Non-establishment of opin  IV Lack of unity of invention  V X Reasoned statement under citations and explanations   | Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with reg   | ard to novelty, inventi   |                           | licability;       |
| VI Certain documents cited  VII Certain defects in the inter  VIII Certain observations on the servations on the servations on the servations. The applicant is hereby invited to reply when? See the time limit indicated a to grant an extension, see Rundle By submitting a written reply For the form and the language. | to this opinion.  bove. The applicant may le 66.2(d).  accompanied, where a | , before the expiration   | ents, according to Rule   |                   |
| Also For an additional opportunit For the examiner's obligation For an informal communical  | to consider amendment   | ts and/or arguments, s  | ee Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i> . |                   |
| If no reply is filed, the international p   |   | eport will be establishe  |                           |                   |
| The final date by which the internation examination report must be established.   | al preliminary<br>according to Rule 69.2                                    | is: <u>20/(</u>   | 4/2005                    | Masches Patentamp |
| Name and mailing address of the IPEA/   |   | Authorized officer  | •                         |                   |
| European Patent Office, P.B. 5<br>NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Nethe<br>Tel.: (+31-70) 340-2040<br>Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016  |   | Examiner  Formalities officer (incl. extension of till Tel. (+49-89) 2399 |                           | ٍ ال              |
| Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march  | 2002)   |   |                           | Office europe     |

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the
  invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the
  criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve
  an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X
  and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.